

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the rejection of all claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

***Claim Amendments***

Claims 1-10 and 13 are amended, claims 14-17 are newly cancelled (claims 11 and 12 previously having been cancelled), and new method claim 18 is added. More specifically:

- Claims 1-10 and 13 have been amended to more specifically provide the location on which the *in vivo* hydrolysable ester is formed as being from an available carboxy or hydroxy group, which amendment is believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection of these claims under section 112, as discussed further below. Support for this amendment is found, *e.g.*, at page 6, lines 11 to 32.
- Claim 9 has also been amended to change the phrase "if necessary" with the more appropriate term "optionally."
- Claim 13 has also been amended to change the phrase "producing an anti-cancer effect" to "treating cancer" in response to the Examiner's enablement comments discussed below.
- Method claims 14-17 have been cancelled to expedite the prosecution of this application to allowance, and replaced with new method claim 18, which more directly claims the disclosed and demonstrated inhibition of CDK2 by administration of a compound of the invention. Support and enablement for claim 18 is found, *inter alia*, in the assays discussed at page 27, line 25 through page 31, line 9.

These amendments have been made without waiver or prejudice to Applicants' right to prosecute any subject matter thereby cancelled, in one or more continuing applications. Inasmuch as these amendments address (and, it is believed, overcome) the remaining grounds for rejection raised by the Examiner, and place the claims in condition for allowance, entry of these amendments after Final Rejection is believed to be appropriate, and is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph***

Claims 1-10 and 13-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite with respect to the term “in vivo hydrolysable esters.” In making this rejection, the Examiner notes at page 2 of the Action that the term “in vivo hydrolysable esters” as explained at specification page 6 is not itself ambiguous. However, the statement in the Action continues, “however, the definition of various substituent groups  $R^1$ ,  $R^2$ ,  $R^3$ ,  $R^4$  include such groups, namely esters, alkoxycarbonyl, carbamates etc. which are also in vivo hydrolysable and therefore it is not clear what is the difference between these variable groups and the ‘in vivo hydrolysable ester’ groups and therefore renders these claims ambiguous.”

The present amendment to claims 1-10 and 13 (claims 14-17 being cancelled) makes clear that the “in vivo hydrolysable esters” recited in the claims are “formed from an available carboxy or hydroxy group.” This amendment is thus believed to clarify the “difference,” referred to in the above-quoted passage as not being clear, thereby overcoming this ground for rejection. As noted above, specific support for this amendment is found in the specification at page 6, lines 11 to 32.